

Submitter: Trevor Hoagland
On Behalf Of:
Committee: House Committee On Judiciary
Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB4088

To whom it may concern,

In short:

If the word of the year is Affordability or even Accountability, this is neither in the case of both the state or the individual involved.

This is not needed. This is not an emergency. This is not helping the citizens of Oregon who are those that pay into this and make these events funded.

Oregon already has a vastly open law regarding the "Reproductive" health this looks aimed to support, as supported by Planned Parenthood's own site and it's constant involvement endorsements and funding in our state elections. As such, the other expansions in here for "reproductive health care and gender-affirming treatment" as quantified in HB 4808 also does not seem to stand for an emergency as all of that is already operating as is.

HIPAA covers patient records, reproductive healthcare is not regulated at the federal level currently, gender affirming care is not even regulated. While there are debates at both ends we have seen how this goes. The current political administration makes a fuss, a federal judge blocks, and then it goes up the chain to be resolved if applicable to constitutional authority or not.

From the looks of it, the main thing this bill does is make the two topics a wider covered service, which impact both the costs of the tax payers for OHA related billings as well as premiums for those paying for healthcare going up as well. It also vastly broadens what information is hidden for personal identification as it infers that HIPAA is not enough.

The Governor not surrendering residents to other states really should go to the SCOTUS to discuss as it is state versus state and possibly case by case as well. However, speaking as a tax payer, can we please prioritize the state not surrendering someone who has had said operation(s) to those that are residents of these state at the time of said operation and are still residents? If we are not going to go after embezzlers of a Eugene News paper in another state, this seems hypocritical to be frank.

As for the Professional and Provider Protections, besides the age of 15, there are no limitations on abortions in the state. So, if an employee is firing people because they

are doing abortions, that seems a business suite, not a state issue. Much like a company that comes to light having child slavery, society will handle it.

So, in short, I oppose it as it does nothing but burden the tax payer and the insurance payer more. It is not an emergency, it does not introduce anything that should be federally mandated, and is not helpful for the state to get in a fight between another state on a citizen from another state that decides to do "gender affirming care" or "reproductive care" tourism.